International Journal of
Computer & Software Engineering
Research Article Open Access

Regional Variation in the Medical Software Approval Process: A Comparative Analysis and Proposal for Quality

Nazma Akter Zinnia[1*] and Eisuke Hanada[2]
[1]*Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Saga University, Saga 8408502, Japan*
[2]*Faculty of Science and Engineering, Saga University, Saga 8408502, Japan*

Abstract

In the rapidly evolving field of healthcare technology, the approval of medical software is crucial for ensuring patient safety and product efficacy. This study examines the regulatory approval process for medical software across various regions, identifying key differences, commonalities, and areas for quality enhancement. A systematic search was conducted using PubMed, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, Google Scholar, and the Cochrane Library for literature published in the last decade. The findings reveal significant variations in regulatory frameworks between major bodies, including the FDA, BMRC, and EMA, highlighting the challenges of achieving global harmonization. The study identifies gaps in current practices and proposes strategies for improvement, including enhanced international cooperation, standardized evaluation criteria, and the integration of advanced technologies for better monitoring. The study concludes with a proposal for a unified regulatory framework that fosters innovation while ensuring the highest standards of safety and quality in medical software development. These insights aim to guide policymakers, industry stakeholders, and researchers in improving the global regulatory landscape.

Publication History:

Received: November 12, 2024
Accepted: November 24, 2024
Published: November 26, 2024

Keywords:

BMRC, FDA, International regulatory practices, Medical software, Regulatory frameworks.

Introduction

The rapid advancement of digital health technologies has led to a growing reliance on medical software for various applications, such as diagnostics, treatment planning, patient monitoring, and overall health management. This shift towards digital solutions in healthcare necessitates a robust regulatory framework to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medical software, commonly referred to as Software as a Medical Device (SaMD). The regulatory landscape for medical software approval varies significantly across regions, with well-established frameworks in the United States, the European Union, and Japan, while countries like Bangladesh are still developing their regulatory approaches. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of current regulatory frameworks for medical software approval and identifies gaps in the regulatory landscape of Bangladesh, then proposes strategies for quality enhancement.

The integration of software with medical devices and standalone medical applications has revolutionized healthcare delivery, improving efficiency, accuracy, and accessibility [1]. However, the increasing complexity of these digital tools necessitates stringent regulatory oversight to ensure patient safety and product efficacy [2]. Regulatory frameworks worldwide, such as those of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Union Medical Device Regulation (MDR), and Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA), have evolved to address these challenges [3-5].

In contrast, the regulatory framework of Bangladesh for medical software is still in its developmental stages, which presents unique challenges and opportunities [6]. This review is a comprehensive analysis of global medical software approval processes, highlights gaps in Bangladesh's approach, and proposes strategies for regulatory enhancement.

The primary research question guiding this article is: "How do regulatory frameworks for the approval of medical software differ across regions, and what are the potential strategies for enhancing the quality of medical software regulation in Bangladesh?" To answer this question, we explore and compare the regulatory practices employed by various countries, identify gaps within Bangladesh's current regulatory framework, and propose strategies to enhance regulatory quality and safety standards for medical software.

Methodology

To distinguish gaps of framework of medical software approval, we made an article. Our review follows the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines to ensure a thorough and unbiased analysis.

Search strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted across multiple databases, including PubMed, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and Google Scholar, using the following keywords:

- "medical software approval"
- "regulatory framework"
- "Software as a Medical Device"
- "Bangladesh"
- "quality assurance"
- "healthcare software regulation"

***Corresponding Author:** Nazma Akter Zinnia, Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Saga University, 1 Chome Honjomachi, Saga 8408502, Japan; E-mail: zinnia.cse7862@gmail.com

Citation: Zinnia AZ, Hanada E (2024) Regional Variation in the Medical Software Approval Process: A Comparative Analysis and Proposal for Quality . Int J Comput Softw Eng 9: 190. doi: https://doi.org/10.15344/2456-4451/2024/190

Studies published in English between January 2010 and December 2023 were included to ensure a contemporary understanding of the regulatory landscape. Boolean operators (AND, OR) were utilized to refine the search results, allowing for a broad yet focused retrieval of studies. In addition to database searches, a manual search of reference lists from relevant articles and grey literature, such as regulatory reports and white papers, was conducted to capture any pertinent studies that might not have been found through database searches..

Eligibility Criteria

The following eligibility criteria were established to determine which studies would be included in the review:

Inclusion Criteria:

- Studies focusing on the regulatory approval processes for medical software, including Software as a Medical Device (SaMD).
- Comparative analyses of regulatory frameworks in various regions (e.g., United States, European Union, Japan, Bangladesh).
- Research articles, reviews, regulatory reports, and case studies published in peer-reviewed journals or credible sources from January 2010 to December 2023.
- Studies written in English.

Exclusion Criteria:

Articles not directly related to the regulation of medical software.
Studies focusing on hardware-based medical devices or general medical device regulation without specific reference to software.
Non-peer-reviewed articles, opinion pieces, editorials, and commentaries.
Studies not available in English or outside the specified publication timeframe.

Study selection

The study selection process involved several stages to ensure rigor and systematic inclusion. Initially, the database searches yielded 1,245 articles. After removing duplicates, 983 unique articles remained. These articles were then screened based on titles and abstracts, resulting in 142 potentially relevant studies. The full texts of these articles were retrieved and assessed against the eligibility criteria. After a thorough review, 48 studies were selected for inclusion.

The selection process was independently conducted by two reviewers to minimize bias, with disagreements resolved through discussion or consultation with a third reviewer. The final set of selected studies included a broad range of research designs, including comparative analyses, case studies, and regulatory reports, providing a comprehensive overview of the current state of medical software regulation globally and in Bangladesh.

Summarizing/results stage

The study selection process involved several stages to ensure rigor and systematic inclusion. Initially, the database searches yielded 1,245 articles. After removing duplicates, 983 unique articles remained. These articles were

Results of the Review

The analysis of 48 studies revealed significant variation in the regulatory approaches for medical software, particularly between developed regions like the U.S., EU, and Japan, and developing regions like Bangladesh.

In the U.S., the FDA employs a risk-based classification system (Class I, II, III) with three regulatory pathways: 510(k) Premarket Notification, De Novo Classification, and Premarket Approval (PMA). This approach ensures a flexible yet rigorous process, balancing innovation and patient safety through mandatory post-market surveillance.

The EU's Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and In Vitro Diagnostic Regulation (IVDR) frameworks also use a risk-based system (Class I, IIa, IIb, III) and require conformity assessments for higher-risk software. Both systems include mandatory Quality Management Systems (QMS) and post-market surveillance.

The EU's Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and In Vitro Diagnostic Regulation (IVDR) frameworks also use a risk-based system (Class I, IIa, IIb, III) and require conformity assessments for higher-risk software. Both systems include mandatory Quality Management Systems (QMS) and post-market surveillance.

Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) follows a similar risk-based model with comprehensive premarket review and robust post-market monitoring, ensuring ongoing software quality.

However, Bangladesh lacks a specific regulatory framework for medical software. The Directorate General of Drug Administration (DGDA) does not implement a risk-based classification system, nor does it have formal post-market surveillance mechanisms. The lack of technical expertise further complicates the evaluation process. These findings underscore the need for substantial regulatory reforms to align Bangladesh with international standards.

Discussion

Comparison of regulatory frameworks:

The regulatory landscape for medical software in Bangladesh is underdeveloped compared to the comprehensive risk-based frameworks in developed countries such as the U.S., EU, and Japan. These frameworks offer structured guidelines, risk-based classification, and rigorous oversight mechanisms to ensure patient safety. However, Bangladesh faces challenges due to the lack of clear guidelines and fragmented regulatory oversight.

To address these gaps, key areas such as the development of specific regulatory guidelines, capacity building among regulators, post-market surveillance, and the adoption of international standards need to be considered (Table 1).

Studies reviewed

Future research should focus on the development of a standardized research framework for medical software in Bangladesh. This includes creating clear research objectives, uniform data extraction methods, and consistent reporting guidelines. Advanced techniques such as machine learning for data analysis can further uncover patterns and insights from regulatory data, enabling better decision-making (Table 2).

Author	Year	Region	Focus of the Study	Methodology	Key Findings
Kramer et al.	2019	United States	Regulatory oversight of medical devices	Systematic Review	Effective risk-based classification system for patient risk management [2].
Taylor et al.	2020	European Union	Impact of MDR/IVDR on SaMD	Qualitative Analysis	Stricter requirements for clinical evaluation and risk management [5].
Ahmed et al.	2021	Bangladesh	Regulatory challenges in medical software approval	Case Study Analysis	Absence of specific guidelines and classification system [7].
Rahman et al.	2022	Bangladesh	Capacity building for medical software regulation	Survey and Interviews	Need for technical expertise and formal regulatory framework [9].

Table 1: Comparison of Key Elements in the Regulatory Frameworks for Medical Software Approval Across Regions.

Regulatory Body	Region	Risk Classification	Approval Pathways	Post-Market Surveillance	Quality Management Systems
FDA	United States	Class I, II, III	510(k), De Novo, PMA	Mandatory	Required
MDR/IVDR	European Union	Class I, IIa, IIb, III	Conformity Assessment, CE Marking	Mandatory	Required
PMDA	Japan	Class I, II, III, IV	Premarket Review, Approval	Mandatory	Required
DGDA	Bangladesh	Not defined	Registration and Listing (not specific)	Not established	Limited

Table 2: Regional grouping highlights the concentration of research efforts in the United States and the European Union.

Key findings

We found significant disparities between the regulatory frameworks of developed countries and Bangladesh. While the U.S., EU, and Japan have established comprehensive, risk-based frameworks for medical software approval, Bangladesh lacks a structured approach, leading to potential risks in software quality and patient safety [12]. The absence of specific guidelines, limited technical expertise, inadequate post-market surveillance, and a fragmented regulatory environment are critical challenges identified for improving Bangladesh's regulatory landscape [13].

Recommendations for Quality Enhancement

To enhance the quality of medical software in Bangladesh, the following recommendations are proposed:

- **Develop Specific Regulatory Guidelines**: Bangladesh should adopt a risk-based classification system for medical software, similar to the frameworks in the U.S., EU, and Japan. This system should define clear criteria for software classification and approval based on risk levels [7, 8, 14].
- **Build Regulatory Capacity**: Enhancing the technical expertise of persons working in regulatory bodies through training programs and collaboration with international regulatory agencies will improve the evaluation and approval process [9, 15].
- **Implement Robust Post-Market Surveillance:** Establishing a formal post-market surveillance mechanism, including mandatory reporting of adverse events and regular software updates, will ensure ongoing safety and effectiveness [10, 16].
- **Centralize the Regulatory Framework**: A centralized framework with clear roles and responsibilities for all regulatory bodies involved will improve consistency and clarity in the approval process [11, 17].
- **Promote Industry Compliance with International Standards**: Encouraging software developers to adhere to international quality standards, such as ISO 13485 and IEC 62304, will enhance software quality and safety [18].

Development of a Standardized Research Framework

We recommend developing a robust framework for conducting systematic reviews and research studies in Bangladesh. This framework should include:

- **Clear Definitions:** Specific definitions of research objectives relevant to local contexts.
- **Standardized Methods:** Uniform methods for data extraction and analysis.

- **Consistent Reporting Guidelines:** Established guidelines for transparent and reproducible reporting.
  Integrating advanced analytical techniques, such as machine learning tools for text mining and network analysis, can also help uncover patterns and insights not easily visible through traditional methods.

- Promoting Collaboration
  Encouraging collaboration with national and international experts is recommended to enhance the quality of research in Bangladesh. Engaging with a diverse group of scholars will bring in varied perspectives and expertise, leading to more robust and comprehensive research outcomes.

Conclusion

Our article highlighted the need for a more harmonized and quality-focused approach to the approval of medical software. While there have been significant efforts towards regulatory harmonization, much work remains to be done to ensure that patients worldwide have access to safe and effective medical software. By adopting the proposed strategies and engaging in international collaboration, regulators can enhance the quality and consistency of medical software approvals, ultimately improving patient outcomes.

The regulation of medical software is crucial to ensuring patient safety and high-quality healthcare delivery. While developed countries have established robust frameworks for the approval of medical software, the regulatory approach of Bangladesh is still evolving. By adopting international best practices, building technical capacity, implementing post-market surveillance, and establishing a centralized regulatory framework, Bangladesh can significantly enhance the quality and safety of its medical software. These efforts will not only align Bangladesh with global standards but also foster innovation and growth in the digital health sector.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author's Contributions

Each author has made substantial intellectual contributions to the study and manuscript, fulfilling the necessary criteria for authorship.

Nazma Akter Zinnia contributed to the conception and design of the study, the acquisition of data, and the analysis and interpretation of the data. She also drafted the manuscript and critically revised it for important intellectual content. She gave final approval of the version to be published.

Eisuke Hanada contributed to the study's design, provided expert guidance in the analysis of data, and was involved in drafting and revising the manuscript. He gave final approval of the version to be published.

Acknowledgement

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all the researchers and authors whose work contributed to this literature review. We extend our appreciation to the institutions and databases, including PubMed, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, Google Scholar for providing access to valuable resources and publications. Special thanks to the researchers who assisted us with comprehensive guidelines and reports that were instrumental in our analysis. Additionally, we acknowledge the support and guidance from academic advisors and colleagues who provided invaluable feedback throughout the research process. Finally, we thank the healthcare professionals and experts in health informatics who offered their insights and expertise, enriching the quality and relevance of this study.

Funding/Financial Disclosure

The authors declare that no funding was received for this research.

References

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Software as a Medical Device (SaMD): Clinical Evaluation.
2. Kramer DB, Xu S, Kesselheim AS (2019) Regulation of medical devices in the United States and European Union. New England Journal of Medicine, 366: 848-855.
3. Shuren J, Patel B (2018) FDA's new digital health policies will support innovation and protect public health. FDA Voice.
4. European Commission (2017) Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and In Vitro Diagnostic Regulation (IVDR).
5. Taylor K, Palmer S (2020) Impact of the EU MDR and IVDR on Software as a Medical Device (SaMD). Regulatory Focus 27: 150-162.
6. Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA). (2018). Regulation of Medical Devices Including Software as Medical Devices. Tokyo: PMDA.
7. Luxton DD (2019) Artificial intelligence in behavioral and mental health care. San Diego: Elsevier.
8. Zhang Y, Patou F (2020) Regulatory frameworks for artificial intelligence in healthcare: Insights from the US, EU, and Japan. Journal of Regulatory Science 8: 12-25.
9. Iyengar S, Wu AW, Cohen G (2021) The role of regulatory policies in improving the quality and safety of medical software. Health Affairs, 40(2), 222-230.
10. Wang Y, Tao X (2022) Enhancing the quality of medical software through regulatory compliance and standardization. International Journal of Medical Informatics 157: 104616.
11. Lim S, Kim J (2020) The role of international standards in enhancing the quality of medical software. Biomedical Engineering Journal 67: 243-258.
12. Gupta R, Singh A (2019) Centralized regulatory approaches for healthcare innovations: The way forward. Journal of Regulatory Science 7: 29-37.
13. European Medicines Agency (EMA) (2021) Guidance on medical device regulation for digital health technologies.
14. Deb B, Ali M (2020) Barriers to effective regulatory practices for medical software in Bangladesh. Journal of Public Health Policy 41: 356-367.
15. Institute of Medicine (IOM) (2018) Medical Devices and the Public's Health: The FDA 510(k) Clearance Process at 35 Years. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
16. Kondo M, Hasegawa Y (2019) Post-market surveillance practices for medical software in Asia-Pacific countries. Medical Device Surveillance Journal 9: 250-256.
17. Hossain N, Rahman F (2023) Proposals for improving medical software regulation in Bangladesh: Lessons from global practices. Bangladesh Journal of Medical Informatics 8: 35-48.
18. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) (2022) Evidence standards framework for digital health technologies.